

City of San José
Coyote Valley Specific Plan

Summary of Task Force Meeting
September 10, 2007
City Hall, Committee Rooms W118-120

Task Force Members Present

Co-Chair Councilmember Forrest Williams, Co-Chair Councilmember Nancy Pyle, Supervisor Don Gage, Chuck Butters, Helen Chapman, Pat Dando, Russ Danielson, Craige Edgerton, Dan Hancock, Melissa Hippard, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkins, Doreen Morgan, Ken Saso, Steve Speno, and Neil Struthers.

Task Force Members Absent

Eric Carruthers, Gladwyn D'Sousa, Chris Platten, and Steve Schott, Jr.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members Present

Beverly Bryant (Home Builders Assoc.), Dawn Cameron (SC County Roads), Mike Griffis (SCC Roads and Airports), Dunia Noel (SCC LAFCO), Tim Steele (Sobrato Development), Pamela Vasudeva (VTA), and Kerry Williams (Coyote Housing Group).

City Staff and Other Public Agencies Present

Anthony Drummond (Council District 2), Lee Wilcox (Council District 10), Rachael Gibson (Office of Supervisor Don Gage), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Maria Angeles (Public Works), Laurel Prevetti (PBCE), Sal Yakubu (PBCE), Susan Walsh (PBCE), Jared Hart (PBCE), Stefanie Hom (PBCE), Regina Mancera (PBCE), and Perihan Ozdemir (PBCE).

Consultants Present

Roger Shanks (Dahlin Group), Jim Musbach (EPS), Darin Smith (EPS), Jodi Starbird (David J. Powers), and Bill Wagner (HMH Engineers).

Community Members Present (Additional people were present; however, the names below only reflect individuals who identified themselves on the sign-up sheet.)

Peter Benson, Roger Costa, Consuelo Crosby, Jo Crosby, Robert Eltgroth, Leila Forouhi, Tricia Finnigan, Lorraine Gabbert, Dorthy Hinze, Virginia Holtz, Dan Kubisz, Jack Kuzia, Elizabeth, Chris Lepe, Rick Linquist, Joanne McFarlain, Mark Anthony Mederios, Maralee Potter, George Reilly, Peter Rothschild, Annie Saso, Pauline Seebach, Pete Silva, Shelle Thomas, George Thomas Jr., Jesse Votaw, Don Weden, Kim Weden, and Robert Yoo.

1. Welcome

The meeting convened at approximately 5:30 p.m. with Co-Chairs Councilmember Forrest Williams and Nancy Pyle welcoming everyone to the Coyote Valley Specific Plan (CVSP) Task Force meeting.

2. Acceptance of Meeting Summaries

- a. Co-chair Councilmember Nancy Pyle called for a motion to accept the August 13, 2007 Task Force Meeting Summary. The motion passed unanimously.

3a. CVSP Phasing Objectives (presented by Sal Yakubu, Principal Planner with the Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement)

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments:

- Will the Task Force be voting on a phasing scenario tonight? What is the process of choosing a scenario? Why has the phasing changed? *Sal indicated that the three phasing scenarios presented tonight are consistent with the current triggers. Some of the previous phasing scenarios presented two years ago were inconsistent with the triggers. The Task Force may decide whether they would like to vote or just provide input to staff.*
- Would like to have a discussion on triggers. *Sal indicated the triggers were discussed at the last Task Force meeting, and the meeting summary and materials are posted on the CVSP website, www.sanjoseca.gov/coyotevalley.*

3b. Illustrative CVSP Build-out Based on Infrastructure Development Sequencing (presented by Bill Wagner, President of HMM Engineers)

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments:

- Is there a list indicating what infrastructure would be built with each phase? *Yes, staff will e-mail the matrix with that information to the Task Force.*
- There is not enough information in the presentation to have a discussion. Some slides presented are not included in the handout. *Bill indicated staff thought it was more prudent to*

present phasing in steps.

- It is good to talk about the issues in steps and get input from the Task Force. The Task Force can discuss the scenarios in detail before making a decision.
- Voting on a phasing scenario would be hard to do without supplemental information.
- The presentation is a chance to look at different phasing scenarios. Not expected to vote on phasing tonight.
- There needs to be a decision on phasing to be able to move forward with the EIR. It is a complicated subject matter.
- Why is phasing being presented again? Will everything change again after there is additional information? *Sal indicated the presentation is an example of how to phase the development of jobs and housing with infrastructure. There is no fiscal information available yet. Phasing was presented over two years ago, and some of the scenarios were inconsistent with the General Plan triggers. In addition, there are some new Task Force members and staff would like to bring everyone up to date.*
- Need to discuss triggers. Cannot develop Coyote Valley with the existing triggers.
- Need to discuss reasons why development would start in certain areas and not elsewhere.
- Issues are being presented at a fast pace. There was no resolution at the last Task Force meeting. Not comfortable making decisions right now.
- Need a final consensus on the triggers before there is a discussion on phasing.
- Should look at what infrastructure is needed and the associated costs, and then make decisions on how to implement the infrastructure. The Task Force should decide the phasing. *Sal indicated the next part of the presentation will discuss job/housing concurrency scenarios. The job/housing concurrency scenarios are different than triggers. Residential development can happen once the triggers are met. The three proposed phasing scenarios are based on the existing triggers.*
- The scenarios presented indicate that phasing has already been decided. *Darin Smith, of Economic and Planning Systems, indicated that the phasing scenarios presented are examples. No decision has been made yet.*
- Need to know the scope and costs associated with each phase. Suggested having a subsequent meeting to discuss that information.
- Some of the Vision and Expected Outcomes are inconsistent with the Plan. Should implement place-making infrastructure early, but also need to make sure there is sufficient funding.
- The scenarios are suggestions on how to start building Coyote Valley. They may seem logical to staff, but would like the Task Force's input.
- The General Plan triggers for CVSP are set. Need to accept it and continue working on the Plan.
- Need more information, such as the scope, costs, and development that is associated with each phase. *Sal indicated that there is no information available on costs yet, but there is information about infrastructure. Staff will e-mail a matrix with that information to the Task Force tomorrow.*
- When will information about costs be available? *Sal indicated that the consultants have been working on a cost analysis, and it will be informed by the input from the Task Force on phasing, and presented at the next meeting in October.*
- The second slide on page 3 of the PowerPoint presentation handout indicates the base phase

would include 5,000 jobs. Does that mean the base phase indicated on page 7 would not include dwelling units? *Yes. Sal apologized for taking out that slide in the presentation, but staff wants to emphasize that the scenarios are just examples of phasing.*

- If the proposed base phase includes 5,000 jobs and no housing, would there be financing for the infrastructure that would need to be added? *Sal indicated that would be analyzed in the financial analysis, and presented at the next Task Force meeting.*
- Would like to know the types of jobs and housing that would be built in each phase. *Staff explained that this information would also be provided at the next Task Force meeting. Staff provided copies of the matrix that describes the required infrastructure for each phasing scenario.*
- Concerned about the “development of the willing” strategy. These are just examples of what staff thinks may happen. The Task Force does not need to agree with these. *Bill indicated that if developers want to develop land that is out of sequence they can do so by over-sizing infrastructure. There is nothing in the plan that precludes that approach.*
- The Plan is not consistent with past Task Force discussions. That is problematic. *Sal indicated this example is consistent with the idea of growing Coyote Valley out from the core and makes a commitment to urban development from the outset. He indicated that a developer that would like to develop outside of the phasing sequence may develop if they are able to fund the extension of infrastructure to serve their property. However, it may not be cost effective for them to do that.*
- Coyote Valley does not look any different from other planning processes. Willing to look at different job/housing scenarios because they are critical to building the kind of community the Task Force has talked about.
- Page 3 of the PowerPoint handout explains the infrastructure sequencing. Is the base phase 5,000 jobs? *Sal clarified that the base phase is 5,000 jobs, which is consistent with the General Plan job trigger requirement. Phase I, which is I-A and I-B, together with the 5,000 as a base, starts growing out Coyote Valley at the ratio of 2:1 until phase II-B. By phase III, there would be 10,000 jobs and 10,000 housing units. This example was based on the 2:1 scenario, but could work for any of the proposed scenarios.*
- The phases do not indicate what each phase comprises. Would like to see further breakdown of the suggested six phases at the next Task Force meeting. Then the Task Force can discuss what elements should be included in the phases. *Sal indicated that the matrix includes infrastructure requirements of each increment.*
- Need to understand the cost of infrastructure associated with each phase of development.
- Phase I-A indicates there would be 5,000 jobs and 5,000 units. But developable areas have a capacity for more jobs and housing. The spreadsheet indicates there is a lot of infrastructure through phase 1A. The costs may not be commensurate with actual development that is going to be allowed.
- There are already permits in place that allow for the construction for 5,000 jobs.
- The Task Force did not want to use Planning Areas as a basis for phasing. Planning Areas limit flexibility and create financial underpinnings. The Phasing Plan does not reflect what the Task Force has talked about and it does not create a sense of place.
- If Phase F develops first near the lake, there would be 10,000 jobs and 5,000 homes. What about schools? What about the other amenities? What happens to the people who live there? *Sal indicated that staff would e-mail a matrix with that information to the Task Force*

tomorrow.

- The Task Force discussed the issue of flexibility early in the process, but now the Plan is becoming too rigid. If infrastructure is constructed in one area, then only that area would be able to develop.
- Do not want all the poor people to live in one area. Would like Coyote Valley to be an integrated community.
- Great Oaks is putting water on the east side of Monterey Highway. It is existing infrastructure on the east side of Monterey Highway and that is not shown on the Plan.
- Monterey road can hold a lot of traffic.
- Is there an existing sewer line that runs down Bailey Avenue and crosses Monterey Highway? *No, there is no substantial storm drain east of Monterey Road.*

4. Overview of CVSP Jobs/Housing Concurrency Scenarios (presented by Darin Smith, of Economic and Planning Systems)

The Task Force provided the following questions and comments:

- Good presentation.
- The phases need to be large. Three phases are adequate.
- Need to be careful about putting restrictions on jobs. Do not want an employer to try to put in 8,000 jobs, but the Plan would only allow 4,000 jobs.
- Need 10,000 housing units to put in infrastructure. Housing should be phased in three phases: I) 10,000, II) 10,000; III) 5,000.
- The Plan should have checkpoints. Should allow flexibility and place-making infrastructure.
- Should simplify the Plan, and make bigger phases.
- The 2:1 concurrency scenario would produce steady and consistent growth. Each phase would have approx. 3,000 students. Schools cannot accommodate large numbers. Steady growth would give schools time to get it right.
- Best presentation in the past five-years. This presentation should have gone first.
- Would like to see infrastructure costs with each phase.
- Supports 2:1 jobs/housing ratio. Do not like market driven scenario. If there is housing before jobs, then there would be too much housing and it would not solve the City's job/housing imbalance.
- The 2:1 jobs/housing ratio is orderly, but should have more flexibility. Overall, each phase should have more jobs than housing. The packaging of build-out is important. The key is to have jobs before housing it built.
- Mixed-use and integrated development is going to need concurrency. Need investment of capital to create a sense of place, and there should also be checkpoints throughout the phasing. If there are no checkpoints, then there should be restrictions on housing. We will also need to look at the fiscal impacts on the City.
- Need to have phasing that will incorporate place-making to ensure that we create the community that we want. There may need to be some trade-offs.
- Does staff understand the Task Force's expectations? *Yes. Sal summarized the Task Force's suggestions.*

5. Public Comments

- Consuelo Crosby, a property owner in the Coyote Greenbelt, indicated the Greenbelt should be discussed at every meeting. This is the first time she has heard the Greenbelt mentioned in the Draft Phasing Objectives.
- Leila Forouhi, a San Jose State Student, indicated that public comment speakers should be allowed more than two-minutes to speak. She also indicated that there is already development going on in Coyote Valley, even though the EIR has not been approved. Developing Coyote Valley is not smart growth; it will only exacerbate urban sprawl. Services would be paid for by taxpayers. The City's budget is already in a deficit. The CVSP has also gotten criticism from the State Attorney General, Jerry Brown.
- Donna, representing Justice for Palestinians, showed a picture of how Coyote Valley looks now, and indicated that the CVSP is a plan of disaster. People cannot survive without nature or animals. The Plan would have a negative impact on lives. The Plan would also impact global warming. If the City is concerned about creating more jobs, then the Berryessa Flea Market should not be closed down.
- Lupe, a concerned citizen, is appalled at how disorganized developers have been during the Task Force meeting. Citizens are victims of out-of-control urban sprawl. The land is rich in wildlife. What type of jobs will the CVSP provide, and at what costs? Water supply and other issues are not addressed in the Plan. Taxpayers are going to be paying for the development of Coyote Valley. The CVSP is only wanted by developers.

6. Adjourn

Co-chair Councilmember Forrest Williams thanked everyone for coming to the Task Force meeting.

He adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:45 p.m.

The next Task Force meeting will take place on October 15, 2007, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.